

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5 and 7-12 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-3 are rejected. Claims 4-8 are objected to. Claim 6 is cancelled herein. New claims 9-12 are added. Claims 1-5, 7 and 8 are amended herein to express the invention in alternative wording, to broaden language as deemed appropriate and to address matters of form unrelated to substantive patentability issues.

Applicant herein traverses and respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims and objections cited in the above-referenced Office Action.

The Office Action states that the specification is objected to for including cites to claims. The specification is amended to remove cites to claims and to correct various typographical, grammatical and idiomatic informalities including those noted in the Office Action. No new matter is added. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully solicited.

Claims 4-8 are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c) as being in improper multiple dependent depending from other multiple dependent claims. Claim 6 is cancelled, rendering the objection moot as to this claim. Claims 4, 5, 7 and 8 are amended to remove the improper multiple dependencies by depending from non-multiple dependent claims. Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No 49-41436 (JP '436). Applicant herein respectfully traverses these rejections. "Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference

disclosure of each and every element of the claimed invention, *arranged as in the claim.*" *Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co* 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (emphasis added). It is respectfully submitted that the cited reference is deficient with regard to the following.

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate a recitation similar to that included in claim 6, cancelled herein, and which was not substantively examined. Claim 1 now recites in pertinent part the following:

a laminated film, having at least a metal layer  
made of antibacterial metal and films of a synthetic  
resin that cover opposing sides of the metal layer; and  
an other synthetic resin, a melting point and a  
softening point of said other synthetic resin being  
lower than a corresponding melting point and a  
corresponding softening point of the synthetic resin  
that form the laminated film

According to the claim requirements, the melting point and softening point of the resin used for the laminated film is selected such that it does not melt/soften by heat applied in the resin molding of the other resin. It is respectfully submitted that the JP '436 reference is silent regarding such relationship of respective melting

points/softening points of the resin of the laminated film and the other resin used for the molding. Rather, JP '436 relies upon use of a thermosetting resin as a coating agent.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3 particularly describe and distinctly claim elements not disclosed in the cited reference. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-3 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 01/83880 or US 2004-0224586. Applicant herein respectfully traverses these rejections.

These references are devoid of teaching relating to an interrelationship of melting/softening points of the adhesive relative to resin used for coating the laminated sheet, and thus fails to anticipate the claims as now written, since claims 1-3 particularly describe and distinctly claim elements not disclosed in the cited reference. Therefore, reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-3 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 9-12 are added and are submitted as patentable over the cited art of record based on the subject matter cited therein in addition to the subject matter of their respective base claims.

Applicant respectfully requests a three (3) month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. Please charge the fee of \$1050 for the extension of time to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

The USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By Frank J. Jordan by:  
Frank J. Jordan  
Reg. No. 20,456  
Attorney for Applicant  
and,

By Lawrence Wechsler  
Lawrence Wechsler  
Reg. No. 36,049  
Attorney for Applicant

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10168  
(212) 986-2340